

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 13, and 15-29 are presently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to clarify certain features to expedite prosecution of this application, and without prejudice to pursuing claims in unamended or other forms in a continuation or other application. New claims 21-29 have been added.

In the Office Action mailed March 19, 2008, claims 1, 3-5, 9, 13, and 15-20 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 1, 3, 4, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,941,387 to Takihara ("Takihara");

(B) Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara and Published U.S. Patent Application No. US 2001/0043799 to Okada et al. ("Okada");

(C) Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara and Published U.S. Patent Application No. US 2004/0264943 to Chen ("Chen"); and

(D) Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara and U.S. Patent No. 7,113,409 to Whitted ("Whitted").

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on June 12, 2008 to discuss the present Office Action, the Takihara reference, and the pending claims. The applicants request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies with this paper in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to correct such deficiencies.

The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the June 12th telephone conference, and they also reflect the agreements reached between the

undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the telephone conference. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgement that proposed amendments to independent claims 1 and 17 would distinguish the claims over Takiara. Claims 1 and 17 have been so amended and, accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of these claims and the claims depending therefrom should be withdrawn.

A. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 15-20 (Takiara)

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,941,387 to Takiara. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the June 12th telephone conference that Takiara cannot support a Section 103 rejection of amended independent claims 1 and 17, and the claims depending therefrom. Accordingly, in light of this agreement, the Section 103 rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 15-20 should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 5 (Takiara and Okada)

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takiara and Okada. Claim 5 depends from allowable base claim 1. Okada is relied on in the Office Action for disclosing that a display facility can include a television. (Office Action, p. 5.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Okada fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takiara, and therefore fail to support a Section 103 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claim 5 is allowable over the combination of Takiara and Okada for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, and the additional features of claim 5. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claim 5 should be withdrawn.

C. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 9 (Takiara and Chen)

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takiara and Chen. Claim 9 depends from allowable base claim 1. Chen is relied on in the Office Action for disclosing a playing device having a top side. (Office Action, p. 5.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Chen fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takiara, and

therefore fail to support a Section 103 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claim 9 is allowable over the combination of Takiyara and Chen for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, and the additional features of claim 9. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 13 (Takiyara and Whitted)

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takiyara and Whitted. Claim 13 depends from allowable base claim 1. Whitted is relied on in the Office Action for disclosing a stacked arrangement for the modules. (Office Action, p. 6.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Whitted fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takiyara, and therefore fail to support a Section 103 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claim 13 is allowable over the combination of Takiyara and Whitted for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1, and the additional features of claim 13. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

D. New Claims


New claims 21-29 have been added in this response. The subject matter of these claims is supported by the Figures and text of the original application (e.g., paragraphs [0020]-[0025] of the application and Figures 1 and 2). Therefore, these claims do not add any new matter to the application and are fully supported under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. New independent claim 23, for example, include several features similar to those of claim 1 (e.g., a data read/write device and an encoding/decoding device configured to be slidably installed with/uninstalled from a playing device). Accordingly, claim 23 is patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, and for the additional features of this independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Aaron J. Poledna at (206) 359-3982.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 6/19/08



Aaron J. Poledna
Registration No. 54,675

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000